DRAFT NOTES:

Water Management Coordinating Team Meeting – 10/21/99 9:30-1:00

AGENDA:

- Asset Lists
- DWRSIM Runs
- Demands
- Game Summary
- End of Stage 1 Scenario
- DT Meeting

I. Introductions - BJ Miller

Reiterate Our Charge:

• Develop and analyze Early and Late Stage 1 with DOI b(2) baseline.

II. Asset List - Steve Hirsh

- November 2 deadline for presentation
- Oct 28 internal deadline
- Some assignments not made
- Follow example format from In-Delta Storage provided by Dave Forkel
- Provide to Steve Hirsh: shirsh@mp.usbr.gov; 916-978-5010 (5005 fax)

C: 8500 cfs expanded Banks has no water supply benefit.

S: Suggest two late lists: early-late and late-late.

S: Add JPOD, Kern package to early Stage 1 - move 8500 expanded Banks to late Stage 1 and make it year round. Also include source shifting and crop shifting.

Assignments:

- Source shifting S Hirsh
- Kern Package Dave Shuster
- Intertie D Shuster and Jim Snow
- Reservoir Reop Mark Cowan
- Acquisition of Delta islands Karl Winkler
- Pumping to storage (part of reservoir reop) D Shuster
- Access to non-project storage Dave Fullerton
- Changes to flood control operations Mike Fris
- Manage WQ of Delta island discharges K. Sharman
- Control of algae growth in CCF Curtis Creel

1

- Use of DCC for WQ put under regulatory flexibility.
- Blending consultant Linda Smith.
- Shifting refuge supplies Joel Miller
- South Delta Program Stein Buer, Mark Cowan

III. DWRSIM Runs - George Barnes

- Did not meet Vernalis WQ standard
- Used upstream AFRP for upstream b(2)

User Demands for Gaming:

- Committee established has not decided on how to make demands more realistic (lower) in wet years.
- Committee has not developed individual demand patterns for 1981-1995 for gaming.
- C: More realistic demand patterns are needed for daily and monthly models used in gaming.
- C: This is an issue for the DT not the modellers.
- Q: What is more realistic historic or 1995 demand levels? R: Historic is not realistic anymore; but recognize that 1995 demands may be too high for wet years. Can't use historic because there have been too many changes WQCP, crop changes, etc.
- C: Pattern shifts are important even if total demands have not changed.
- S: Put demand patterns in daily model and then allow reductions.
- S: Hardwire 15 year demands into game.
- C: Export strategy is more important than the delivery pattern.
- C: Operators make decisions in real time.
- C: Demands change with the weather.
- S: We still need a demand pattern for each year.
- C: Our EWA actions will affect the demand patterns.
- Q: Can we adjust demands during the game? R: Yes.
- S: We should pregame patterns, then adjust.

V. Gaming Process - Mike Fris

- 1981-1995 list of issues and concerns, status, and priority table
- tentative prioritization by what would go first priority may change with specific circumstances may adjust during game
- List provides a means of scoring (e.g., what % of A's met)
- Various options/means for addressing issues depending on assets available
- Taking actions/steps changes how you would address issues.
- Real-life we don't have the luxury of this list nor should we let it control gaming.

- Next step decide what A and B priorities consist of. How much and how long?
- S: suggest develop a biological problems list.
- Q: Did you use historic or modeled density for salvage? R: Historic..
- Q: April 81 With an Accord Base how did you take into account Accord changes from d 1485 base? R: salvage used to assess fish presence under various hydrologies. Its an issue in the game when we develop new hydrology.
- Q: How does Accord account for changes? R: Take was high but we had a high smelt index (FMWT). The pattern of take shifted.
- C: Concerned that the model does not predict changes in hydrology on fish distribution.
- R: We did take changes into account when making decisions for example in July of 1981 we took no actions despite historically high salvage because our earlier actions would likely have reduced chances of a July event. We don't know how fish will respond to these changes. Without other data we will have to continue using historical densities. This will be clearer in games 3 and 4. We identified D1485 impacts for 1981 Accord, EWA, and b(2) will all reduce the impacts.
- Q: What about population effects. R: not assessed.
- Q: Would Accord have solved 81 salvage problem? R: would have helped.
- C: Concerned about the use of so much foresight. R: On the budget approach of scenarios 1 and 2 we have to be conservative and hedge.
- Q: Comparisons among scenarios: with historical data as the biological base what is the effect of changing the base and what affect do gaming actions have? Improvements in the base or game. R: We keep track of both in gaming.
- C: Concerned about the biological effects of changing the baseline. Models don't replicate historical conditions.

Gaming Discussion:

- Q: How are assets to be shared?
- Q: What about the availability of b(2) water for gaming? R: b(2) accounting is still being worked out.
- C: b(2) may be easy in some hydrologies.
- C: Scenarios 3 and 4 do not require us to account for b(2) during gaming accounting can occur later.
- C: Simulating b(2) as you have is probably within one order of magnitude. Ok to use some basic b(2) assumptions and move forward but be clear on assumptions.
- Q: What next? Our objectives? R: learn something about EWA, b(2), and water costs.
- C: Need pressure on DOI to tell us how to operate b(2).
- S: Go ahead with our assumptions and later adjust when we get a better definition.
- C: Use DOI assumptions and move forward.

C: We need more details in the 15 year list.

C: Need to know what State will do about b(2)

Water Quality:

- Fall flows and February organic
- tradeoffs between water and money

Monday Gaming:

• Provide b(2) assumptions for input into daily model.

Other Subjects:

- Evaluation criteria
- Population effects
- Water Quality/Supply issues
- Non-biological benefits
- Object of scenario evaluations
- ESA assurances and confidence